

REMARKS**Allowed Claims**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 22-25 and 27-29 have been allowed.

Drawings

Figures 1, 3, 8A and 11, as filed on September 10, 1999, were objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.84 or 1.152 in the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO 948) mailed from the Patent Office on February 15, 2000 (Paper No. 8).

Replacement Figures 1, 3, 8A and 11, which correct the informalities noted in Paper No. 8, are being filed concurrently herewith, thereby obviating this objection.

Rejections of Claims 31-32 and 35-36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 31-32 and 35-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kim *et al.* (*J. Virology*, 72(1):811-816 (1998)) as evidenced by Luciw (Paul Luciw, *Fundamental Virology*, 3rd edition, Fields, Knipe and Howley (editors-in-chief), Lippencott-Raven, Philadelphia, Chapter 27, page 850 (1996)). Claims 31 and 35 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Srinivasakumar *et al.* (*J. Virology*, 71(8):5841-5848 (1997)) as evidenced by Luciw (Paul Luciw, *Fundamental Virology*, 3rd edition, Fields, Knipe and Howley (editors-in-chief), Lippencott-Raven, Philadelphia, Chapter 27, page 850 (1996)).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that Claims 31-32 and 35-36 are anticipated by the teachings of Kim *et al.* Applicants also disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that Claims 31 and 35 are anticipated by Srinivasakumar *et al.* However, in an effort to advance prosecution in the subject application and without acquiescing to the Examiner's rejections or waiving the right to prosecute these claims in the future, Claims 31-32 and 35-36 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Rejection of Claims 31-33 and 35-37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 31-33 and 35-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim *et al.* (*J. Virology*, 72(1):811-816 (1998)) or Srinivasakumar *et al.* (*J. Virology*, 71(8):5841-5848 (1997)) in view of Naldini *et al.* (*Science*, 272:263-267 (1992)).


Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assessment that Claims 31-33 and 35-37 are unpatentable over Kim *et al.* or Srinivasakumar *et al.* in view of Naldini *et al.* However, in an effort to advance prosecution in the subject application and without acquiescing to the Examiner's rejection or waiving the right to prosecute these claims in the future, Claims 31-33 and 35-37 have been cancelled without prejudice.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Helen Lee
Registration No. 39,270
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: March 15, 2004